22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ANTHONY MICHAEL MILANO.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00414-MMD-CBC

Plaintiff,

ORDER

٧.

JOHN DOE et al.,

Defendants.

## DISCUSSION 1.

In compliance with this Court's order, Defendants have entered a limited notice of appearance and have attempted to identify the John Does who attended to Plaintiff's medical needs around June 10 and 16, 2015. (See ECF Nos. 19, 22). Defendants have identified Dr. Raymond Mondora and physician's assistant Danielle Miller as potential Doe defendants. (ECF No. 22 at 2). The Court now substitutes these two individuals as the Doe defendants identified in the screening order. Pursuant to the screening order, Count I, alleging due process-medical violations, will proceed against Defendants Dr. Raymond Mondora and Danielle Miller. (See ECF No. 9 at 5).

## II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is ordered that the Clerk of the Court remove "John Doe" from the docket and add Dr. Raymond Mondora and Danielle Miller as defendants in this case.

It is further ordered that the operative complaint is the first amended complaint (ECF No. 4).

It is further ordered that Count I, alleging due process-medical violations, will proceed against Defendants Dr. Raymond Mondora and Danielle Miller.

It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court shall issue summonses for Defendants Dr. Raymond Mondora and Danielle Miller, and deliver the same, to the U.S. Marshal for service. The Clerk shall send to Plaintiff two (2) USM-285 forms. Plaintiff shall have

thirty (30) days within which to furnish to the U.S. Marshal the required USM-285 forms with relevant information as to each Defendant on each form.

It is further ordered that, within **twenty (20) days** after receiving from the U.S. Marshal a copy of the USM-285 forms showing whether service has been accomplished, Plaintiff must file a notice with the Court identifying which Defendant(s) were served and which were not served, if any. If Plaintiff wishes to have service again attempted on an unserved Defendant(s), then a motion must be filed with the Court identifying the unserved Defendant(s) and specifying a more detailed name and/or address for said Defendant(s), or whether some other manner of service should be attempted.

It is further ordered that the Clerk also **shall send** sufficient copies of the first amended complaint (ECF No. 4) and this order to the U.S. Marshal for service on Defendant(s).

It is further ordered that Plaintiff shall serve upon Defendants or, if appearance has been entered by counsel, upon the attorney(s), a copy of every pleading, motion or other document submitted for consideration by the Court. Plaintiff shall include with the original paper submitted for filing a certificate stating the date that a true and correct copy of the document was mailed to the Defendants or counsel for the Defendants. The Court may disregard any paper received by a district judge or magistrate judge which has not been filed with the clerk, and any paper received by a district judge, magistrate judge or the clerk which fails to include a certificate of service.

DATED THIS 28 day of November 2018.

United States Magistrate Judge